

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/787,348	03/16/2001	Tom Marttila	6009-4601US	7865
27123 7	590 08/24/2004		EXAM	INER
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.			HAMILTON, ISAAC N	
	NANCIAL CENTER NY 10281-2101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3724	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		$\mathcal{A}$
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisom: Addism	09/787,348	MARTTILA, TOM
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Isaac N Hamilton	3724
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 26 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (* condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this a	application. A proper reply to a t which places the application in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b	)]
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off	Advisory Action, or (2) the date stater than SIX MONTHS from the S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS edate on which the petition under of extension and the correspond of the shortened statutory period force later than three months after	e mailing date of the final rejection. S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ing amount of the fee. The appropriate extension or reply originally set in the final Office action; or
<ul> <li>imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37</li> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF</li> </ul>	's Brief must be filed within	the period set forth in issal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by		• •
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require furth		arch (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note		,
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding numb	er of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):	
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	d be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		considered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOI	LELY to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-17,19 and 22-26</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-3, 5-7, 9	9 <u>, 10, 18, 20, 21</u> .	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b)  disapprove	ed by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		,
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Dh.
		STEPHEN CHOI PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The removal of the limitation "or aluminum" changes the claim significantly, which raises new issues that would require further search and consideration.